

HIGHER EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Staff Notes

January 24th 2006

In attendance

Committee Members: Michael Pavel, Robert Segura, Tim Stensager, Libby Street, and Diana Holz, Ray Lawton, Michael Miles, Beth Thew, Steve Mullen

Technical Support: Jan Yoshiwara, SBCTC; Carol Jenner, OFM; Kyra Kester, OSPI; Cindy Morana, COP; Bryan Wilson, WTECB, **Maddy Thompson, WTECB; Vi Boyer, ICW; Karen Copetas, WWU; Loretta Seppanen, SBCTC; Randy Spaulding, HECB**

Staff: Deb Merle, Governor's Policy Office; Dana Richardson, Governor's Policy Office; Marc Webster, Office of Financial Management; Ann Daley, Washington Learns; Sarah Reyneveld, Washington Learns; Shanon Byrne, Washington Learns

The Committee heard an update on Chair Roberta Green's absence.

Deborah Merle reported back to the group on the January 12th Steering Committee Meeting.

Dick Lutz and Bill Chance delivered a presentation on their briefing paper entitled "Survey of the State Pre K-20 Programs and Initiatives." The presentation consisted of a summary of the research the team had conducted on consolidated K-20 systems in other states. The team identified three types of K-20 programs including the consolidated structure, common student data system, and common single education budget. The team concluded that while many states have taken steps towards coordination, there is an absence of consolidated K-20 programs in other states.

The committee spent the rest of the day in their subgroups, enrollment and transitions. The Funding group did not meet.

Transition Work Group

In Attendance:

Work Group Members: Michael Pavel, Robert Segura, Tim Stensager, Libby Street, and Diana Holz

Technical Support: Jan Yoshiwara, SBCTC; Carol Jenner, OFM; Kyra Kester, OSPI; Cindy Morana, COP; Bryan Wilson, WTECB; Deb Merle, Governor's Policy Office; Dana Richardson, Governor's Policy Office

Transitions Panel Members: Mike Reilly, ICORA, CWU; Doug Scrima, ICORA, Evergreen; Jim Sulton, HECB; Gene Colin, HECB; Ellen O'Brien Saunders, WTECB

Observers: Emily Leggio, UW; Julie McNally, UWHS Program Director, UW Extension; Michelle Stender, Counsel, Senate Republican Caucus, Sid Sidorowicz, City of Seattle; Seanna Melchior Ruvkun, WDC of Seattle-King County; Melissa Heaton, Gates Foundation Consultant; Sara Singleton, Council of Faculty Representatives-WWU; Gary King, WEA

Dual Credit Position statements: The group reviewed the position statements as they had been revised during the January 8 meeting and heard comments from transition panel members and observer. Members present agreed to some wording changes and suggested that this latest draft be circulated one final time to the members of the work group who were not present. Pending their approval, the position statements will be sent on to the Higher Education Advisory Committee for review by the entire committee. The position statements now read:

The work group supports

I. An array of HS-IHE dual credit options, including but not limited to College in the High School, Running Start, Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, and Tech-Prep, and

a. Encourages ensuring access and opportunity for all students, particularly ensuring that students of color and low income students can participate

b. Encourages the state to expand opportunities to meet the needs of all students.

c. Supports the guidelines for College in the High School established through collaboration among OSPI, SBCTC, HECB, and COP and their proposal to the legislature for a funding formula to support these programs.

d. Agreed that each option for dual credit should have clearly articulated and well-publicized operational guidelines

II. Collaboration and professional development between K-12 and post-secondary systems at all levels: boards of trustees and school boards, higher education presidents and district superintendents, high school faculty and faculty and deans at higher education institutions and counseling and advising staff in both sectors, and agreed that:

a. The state should support this collaboration.

- b. Collaboration should lead in some material way to changes at both the high schools and in college classrooms related to cooperative agreements/memorandums of understanding that detail the extent of support services, curriculum, instructional strategies, and assessment.
- c. Collaboration should lead to an understood continuum of skills from high school through college in writing and math, among other content areas. It should help us clarify how we scaffold rigor.

Transition from High School to Post-Secondary Education: The committee then heard from the panel that Cindy Morana had assembled to discuss challenges related to transition from high school to post-secondary education. Mike Reilly and Doug Scrima provided a summary of barriers that ICORA (Interinstitutional Committee of Registrars and Admissions Officers) believe students in Washington State face in transitioning to post-secondary education, identified efforts underway in Washington State, and policy recommendations.

Proposed Minimum Admission Standards: A considerable portion of the discussion was devoted to the Proposed Minimum College Admissions Standards. Dr. Sulton provided some background on the development of the standards. He indicated that the proposal identifies high school experiences that predict college success. He said that while this proposal continues to identify standards in terms of seat-time, HECB members and others who were involved in developing the proposal recognize the need to reach beyond seat time to competencies. He suggested that a primary purpose of the proposal is to communicate to students as early as possible and to their teachers and to teacher education programs the experiences that make them better prepared to be successful in college. Another purpose is to erase the artificial lines of demarcation between colleges and high schools.

Regarding competencies, the Transitions Math Project (TMP) is already beginning to identify competencies for high school mathematics instruction, and the HECB has received funding to continue this work in the areas of science and English. Dr. Sulton emphasized the importance of supplanting grades with competencies as what students understand they must achieve to be college ready. He also felt that competency statements provide a more common language among agencies who are preparing students for college -- public schools, private schools, home schools - and the colleges to which students apply. He and others believe the TMP, science and English projects will provide a competency-based cross-walk with course and grade based admission standards. Dr. Sulton suggested that this is nothing more than truth in advertising: telling students up front what it takes to be successful.

Deb Merle reiterated that while the work group needed to be informed about the proposed standards and might take a position on the standards, statutory authority related to the standards remains with the HECB.

As discussion continued, it became clear that there was some disagreement about the actual requirements of the standards. Consequently, the work group will ask the HECB for clarification. Contingent on answers to the questions posed, the work group encourages OSPI, COP, HECB, and SBCTC to move forward with defining, justifying and accepting college readiness standards, to specify barriers to implementation, and to identify solutions and associated timelines and costs to overcome the barriers.

Transition Barriers: As the day came to an end, Tim asked members to generate a list of transition barriers from high school to college. This list will form a starting point for the next meeting's discussions.

Enrollment Work Group

In attendance

Committee Members: Ray Lawton, Michael Miles, Beth Thew, Steve Mullen

Technical Support: Maddy Thompson, WTECB; Vi Boyer, ICW; Karen Copetas, WWU; Loretta Seppanen, SBCTC; Randy Spaulding, HECB

Observers: George Scarola, League of Education Voters, Dan Keller, Consultant Team, Angela Kerwin, Prosperity Partnership

The work group started out hearing presentations on the distribution or allocation of enrollments. Marc Webster discussed the method the executive and legislative branches follow in developing the budget. In addition, he walked the group through the evolution of how per-student subsidies are calculated, including the Tuition and Enrollment Change Model (TECM), and the more recent use of peer averages in determining subsidies.

Then, Loretta Seppanen explained how the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges allocates enrollments to its 34 campuses (the budget gives the Board one lump sum of enrollments, and allows the Board to decide how to divide them between colleges). Their method uses recent demographic trends, performance on a variety of indicators and program mix (workforce training, basic skills, academic transfer) to determine the final distribution.

Both the baccalaureate and associate level allocations depend, in large part, on demographic information collected by OFM's Forecasting Division. Due to interest on the part of Group members, someone (Irv or Carol) from Forecasting will make a presentation on demography and the intersection with enrollment forecasts at the February 21st meeting.

The rest of the meeting focused on final alterations to the work plan as laid out in the legislation. Beth Thew wanted to make sure various non-traditional apprenticeship programs and business partnerships were included in the group's understanding of 'workforce training.' Ray Lawton reiterated that the group needs to understand how

the private/independent colleges are able to offer so many high-demand programs, and ways the state might better use capacity in that system. Karen Copetas warned that there are serious legal and ethical issues with directing state money and students to institutions with religious missions/backgrounds.

The group also began to sketch out the order in which the Consultant should tackle the six legislative 'charges'. Specifically, the Group wanted a focus on the number and distribution of enrollments needed to meet demographic and workforce needs to be the first issue addressed, as other issues are ultimately derived from this central piece of information. Then, the Group discussed how to better integrate with the Funding Work Group, as so many of the issues raised by the Enrollment Group will have fiscal implication.

Finally, Steve Mullen cautioned the group that grandiose expectations for either funding or radical change must be tempered with reality. A plan costing too much won't survive first contact with the legislature. Even modest funding goals become a burden when the state's revenue declines. This parting thought forced the group to think creatively about how to build stability into a system and funding structure that's seen precious little of it over the past twenty years, and ways to ensure that Washington Learns recommendations become an integral part of the state's budgeting and planning.